

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	ANDREW J. HARAKAS, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	H. BARTOW FARR, III, ESQ.	
6	On behalf of the Respondents	28
7	BARBARA B. McDOWELL, ESQ.	
8	On behalf of the United States,	
9	as amicus curiae, supporting the Respondents	44
10	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
11	ANDREW J. HARAKAS, ESQ.	
12	On behalf of the Petitioner	52
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(11:04 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: We'll hear argument
next in No. 02-1348, Olympic Airways v. Rubina Husain.

Mr. Harakas. Am I pronouncing your name
correctly?

ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANDREW J. HARAKAS
ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

MR. HARAKAS: Yes, Your Honor.

Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court:

Over 70 years ago, the drafters of the Warsaw
Convention created a treaty which set forth the
circumstances under which air carrier liability should be
created in the event of passenger injury or death. The
legal regime they created recognized there's circumstances
where the passenger should be entitled to a cause of
action, but it also expressly recognized the need to limit
that liability and set forth certain conditions when that
limited liability would apply. Article 17 of the Warsaw
Convention creates a presumption of liability but only
when three conditions precedent are satisfied.

One, there has to be an accident in which the
passenger suffers a bodily injury or dies and the accident
took place on board the aircraft or during the course of
embarking or disembarking.

1 The issue before the Court here today -- we're
2 dealing with the accident condition precedent. Was that
3 satisfied in this case?

4 Of course, the -- the Court in Saks in 1985
5 specifically addressed the issue of what is an accident,
6 and the Court defined an accident as an unusual and
7 unexpected event that's external to the passenger.

8 Of a particular importance to this case is where
9 the Court declined to extend the accident and encompass an
10 injury that results from the passenger's own internal
11 condition and -- and in response to the normal and
12 expected operations of the aircraft.

13 Thus, until recently, the courts have held that
14 injuries arising out of the passenger's preexisting
15 medical conditions do not satisfy the accident condition
16 precedent even if there were allegations of air carrier
17 negligence.

18 QUESTION: I take it you don't take the position
19 that -- that, let's say, any death resulting in part as a
20 result of one, but not the only, cause of the preexisting
21 conditions is thereby excluded from the -- the class of
22 liability.

23 MR. HARAKAS: I think you have -- Justice --

24 QUESTION: Every -- in other words, having a
25 heart condition does not immunize Olympic Airlines against

1 liability if somebody dies of a heart attack per se.

2 You're not taking that position.

3 MR. HARAKAS: Our position is that if somebody
4 is on board an aircraft and they die of a heart attack,
5 that is -- that is not an -- that's a -- the passenger's
6 own internal reaction and it just happened to be -- the
7 passengers happened to be on board the aircraft.

8 QUESTION: Sure, if -- if they're simply sitting
9 in the seat and nothing unusual happens and they have a
10 heart attack and die, sure, there's no liability. But if
11 there are other conditions -- and the argument here is
12 that there are other conditions -- and the heart attack
13 was merely a contributing cause -- it was a condition upon
14 which those other conditions acted -- that does not -- the
15 existence of a heart condition does not immunize Olympic
16 Airlines against liability. That's -- I don't think
17 that's your argument, is it?

18 MR. HARAKAS: Well, no. What the argument is --
19 and in this case here, you have to look to what is the
20 injury-producing event? The injury-producing event
21 here --

22 QUESTION: And -- and they say the injury-
23 producing event is -- or one of the -- the analyses is the
24 unexpected refusal of the airline personnel to allow this
25 individual to get moved into a smoke-free zone. And that

1 unusual and unexpected event, combined with the smoke and
2 the heart condition, caused the death. But it was the
3 unexpected refusal to remove from a smoke zone that is the
4 unexpected event or occurrence that is the accident. What
5 is your answer to that?

6 MR. HARAKAS: I respectfully disagree with the
7 characterization, which was adopted by the court below, in
8 that in this case you have to -- you -- you can't just
9 simply look to the fact that you had the flight attendant
10 saying we're not going to move you. He was assigned a
11 non-smoking seat. He --

12 QUESTION: He was assigned a non-smoking seat
13 which happened to be in a zone with smoke.

14 MR. HARAKAS: Well, in -- on board any aircraft,
15 when smoking is allowed, you have ambient cigarette smoke
16 throughout the aircraft, and in this case you have to look
17 to -- it can't be disputed that this passenger reacted to
18 the cigarette smoke and the injury-producing event
19 indirect --

20 QUESTION: But less in -- less in row 15 than in
21 row 48.

22 MR. HARAKAS: That's -- that's correct, Justice
23 Ginsburg. However, when you have -- when you -- in any
24 aircraft when you -- when they used to allow smoking on
25 the aircraft, as at this time, you could be 10 rows away

1 and you would still be exposed to that ambient cigarette
2 smoke.

3 But the point we have to look to is with respect
4 to the Warsaw Convention is what type of liability did
5 they want to create. You know, when we get into issues of
6 straying away from the direct cause -- because when we
7 look to almost every single Warsaw Convention accident
8 case, the focus has always been on what is that direct
9 injury-producing event. When we start inserting common
10 law concepts of --

11 QUESTION: Well, you say direct, are -- are you
12 trying to make the -- the act omission distinction?

13 MR. HARAKAS: Well, the act and -- in one
14 respect, but -- but in the broader sense, you have to look
15 to is what has always been the event the courts have
16 looked to, what did the drafters intend the event -- the
17 -- the cause to be? It's not -- I don't think it's proper
18 to inject full-blown common law notions of proximate
19 causation.

20 QUESTION: No -- no one is -- no one is making
21 the common -- I don't think is making the common law
22 argument here. They're saying it was unexpected as a
23 matter of fact that somebody who wanted a -- a smokeless
24 seat, who found there was smoke in the area of the seat
25 and who was asked to be moved, would be refused by the

1 airline. That is the unexpected event.

2 MR. HARAKAS: But -- but that's what courts have
3 done after the Supreme Court's decision here by the Court
4 in Tseng because at that time, before Tseng, courts used
5 to find that it didn't matter whether you had allegations
6 of true negligence because we do have to look to --

7 QUESTION: The -- the point is the allegations
8 are not of negligence, which is a legal and normative
9 conclusion.

10 MR. HARAKAS: Yes.

11 QUESTION: The allegation is simply, as a matter
12 of fact, it is not to be expected that a stewardess would
13 stand there and say, no, you can't move him. Whether it
14 was negligent or not negligent, it simply was unexpected
15 as a matter of fact, and they're saying that satisfies the
16 unexpected event.

17 MR. HARAKAS: I -- I disagree. I don't think
18 that satisfies the unexpected event.

19 QUESTION: Well, it could and it is different
20 from ordinary negligence. I mean, it is conceivable at
21 least that to have an airline stewardess say no when the
22 policy of the airline and the standard generally is to the
23 contrary and to say, no, I will not consider moving you
24 even though there were seats further away from the smoke
25 origin.

1 MR. HARAKAS: I don't believe in the -- for
2 purposes of the article 17 accident analysis, you -- you
3 -- your -- you should or should be allowed or it's proper
4 to go beyond looking to asking what is that injury-
5 producing event.

6 In this instance here, we have to remember too
7 that, yes, there were three requests to be moved.
8 However, the passenger himself never asked to be moved.
9 It was always through his wife. He was a doctor. He knew
10 his own condition. I mean, we can all get into the whole
11 reasonableness issue, but what happened --

12 QUESTION: Which -- which is a matter of
13 defense.

14 QUESTION: Yes.

15 MR. HARAKAS: Yes, it's a matter of defense.

16 QUESTION: But Justice O'Connor's question and
17 my question is -- is the question that goes to whether you
18 get into court to defend. And you're -- you're giving us
19 a -- an argument that, in effect, we weren't negligent.

20 MR. HARAKAS: No.

21 QUESTION: But our questions were wasn't it
22 unexpected in fact that somebody would be in the position
23 that this passenger was in.

24 MR. HARAKAS: I don't -- well, I think that's
25 where the courts below and where you get -- where you can

1 cross the lines and confuse the concepts of negligence and
2 causation in this case because here you could say was it
3 unusual, unexpected for a -- for a -- when a passenger
4 makes a request to be moved. In a certain sense, yes, you
5 could say that it was -- it could unusual, unexpected, but
6 I think you have to come back to is but is that the
7 injury-producing event. And that's what the courts look
8 to.

9 QUESTION: Were there other seats available in
10 the economy section?

11 MR. HARAKAS: There were other seats available,
12 Chief Justice.

13 QUESTION: In the economy section?

14 MR. HARAKAS: In the economy seat section. I
15 think when you -- it was very difficult to determine
16 because the plane was -- there were approximately 11
17 seats. Some of those 11 seats were in the smoking
18 section, but the --

19 QUESTION: And in addition, there were the no-
20 revenue people who could have been asked to leave.

21 MR. HARAKAS: There were the non-revenue people,
22 but when you look to the record, the only way you could
23 determine the non-revenue people -- in fact, we had to
24 submit post-trial submissions after the trial to -- for
25 somebody to testify to interpret the codes that were on

1 the passenger manifest to determine who were revenue and
2 who were non-revenue.

3 QUESTION: This doesn't have anything to do with
4 the case, does it?

5 MR. HARAKAS: No, it doesn't, Your Honor. It
6 doesn't have --

7 QUESTION: So what are we talking about it for?
8 I mean, it -- it -- the issue before us is not negligence.

9 MR. HARAKAS: It's not --

10 QUESTION: The issue before us is whether it was
11 an accident.

12 MR. HARAKAS: Exactly. It is whether it was an
13 accident.

14 QUESTION: May I ask this question? I know you
15 didn't argue about negligence, but you do seem to draw a
16 distinction between affirmative conduct on the one hand
17 and failure to act on the other hand. And my question to
18 you is, supposing that without asking the stewardess, the
19 passenger had gotten into a -- a non-smoking seat seven or
20 eight rows ahead of where he was sitting and then was
21 ordered to return to his seat. Would that have been an
22 accident?

23 MR. HARAKAS: Under the circumstances, no, I
24 don't think under -- for purposes of the Warsaw
25 Convention, that would have been an accident.

1 QUESTION: That would have been.

2 MR. HAKAKAS: It would not have been an

3 accident.

4 QUESTION: It would not have been.

5 MR. HAKAKAS: Because again, the injury --

6 QUESTION: So then -- then you don't rely on a

7 distinction for the action and non-action.

8 MR. HAKAKAS: Well, because -- well, I do rely

9 on the distinction between action and non-action because

10 you could have an omission which in and of itself cannot

11 be an accident. I -- I really gave a lot of thought to

12 this. I looked at the cases and I could never find a pure

13 omission being an accident. A omission can result in an

14 accident.

15 QUESTION: Well, why is this a pure omission?

16 It seems to me she misrepresented that the plane was full

17 twice when that wasn't true. That doesn't sound like an

18 omission to me. She told the wife to sit down. She --

19 well, how do you treat that she was supposed to report

20 such incidents to her supervisor and she didn't do that?

21 MR. HAKAKAS: The -- the bottom line of the

22 allegations here were that the -- the flight attendant

23 should have taken action to move Mr. -- Dr. Hanson to

24 another seat, and failure to do so would be --

25 QUESTION: And part of what -- part of what she

1 had --

2 MR. HARAKAS: -- in itself an omission.

3 QUESTION: Part of the picture is things that
4 she affirmatively did do, and part are things she didn't
5 do. And I don't understand that the law makes a
6 distinction between doing what one should not have done or
7 not doing what one should have done.

8 MR. HARAKAS: Generally in -- under negligence
9 law -- under negligence law a negligence can be an act or
10 omission. But here, when you're looking to the treaty of
11 an accident defined as an unusual, unexpected event or
12 happening, you basically have a non-event, something that
13 did not happen. You -- you see that I think in the --

14 QUESTION: Yes, but you -- you say you wouldn't
15 draw the distinction I suggested. So assume the case was
16 the other way around, that the stewardess told him to get
17 back to his seat. Now, why would that not be an accident?

18 MR. HARAKAS: Because at that point, when he got
19 back to his seat, he would be back to his normal assigned
20 non-smoking seat. While in close proximity to the smoking
21 section, again, you have to see that smoke on a smoking
22 aircraft, a known smoking aircraft, nobody -- you know,
23 there was no surprise here when he got on board on this
24 aircraft that there was a -- there was going to be smoke
25 on this aircraft -- is not an unusual, unexpected event.

1 QUESTION: But I want to be sure I understand
2 your position. If the stewardess had gone to the captain
3 of the plane and said, we've got a guy in the back seat
4 who said he's going to die because he can't stand smoke,
5 he wants to sit in the front seat, and he's grabbed a seat
6 up there, should I order him back to the old seat, and the
7 captain says, yes, send him back, would that be an
8 accident?

9 MR. HARAKAS: Under the Warsaw Convention, I
10 don't think it would be an accident, and here's why. It
11 -- these are extreme examples that -- with respect to that
12 where -- the passenger in this case -- don't forget too,
13 the flight attendant did give the option to this passenger
14 to move. He could have taken self-help to remedy the
15 situation, but he opted not to. But in those type of
16 situations, you have instances where they're very extreme
17 examples, but -- and the convention doesn't necessarily
18 provide a remedy for all those types of situations.

19 QUESTION: I -- I take it -- I take it you think
20 -- is it Abramson in the Third Circuit where they -- the
21 -- the passenger can't lie -- lie down.

22 MR. HARAKAS: Exactly, Justice Kennedy.

23 QUESTION: You take the position that case is
24 wrong?

25 MR. HARAKAS: No. That -- that position -- that

1 case is -- is 100 percent correct and it's very analogous
2 to our case because in the Abramson --

3 QUESTION: That's -- that's -- it seems to me
4 there's an accident in that case.

5 MR. HARAKAS: In that case, the -- the court of
6 appeals found there was not an accident.

7 QUESTION: I understand, but it seems to me that
8 there is.

9 MR. HARAKAS: Well, Abramson followed the --
10 almost the exact criteria set forth by the Court in Saks.
11 Was it an unusual, unexpected event? And they found that
12 being seated in an aircraft seat -- you're assigned an
13 aircraft seat -- is not -- and sustaining an injury due to
14 your own internal reaction was not an accident because
15 they, again, focused on what was the precise factual event
16 that led to the injury.

17 QUESTION: Of course, there it seems to me that
18 the -- the internal cause is -- is much greater than it --
19 it is here.

20 Let -- let's -- can we take the case on the
21 assumption -- I think we must take the case on the
22 assumption, based on the -- on the findings of the
23 district court, that if they had moved the passenger, the
24 event would not have occurred.

25 MR. HARAKAS: We have to --

1 QUESTION: Now --

2 MR. HARAKAS: Yes. We have to take --

3 QUESTION: -- if we take the case on that

4 assumption, it's -- it seems to me it's got to be an

5 accident.

6 MR. HARAKAS: I disagree, Justice Kennedy,

7 because again, I -- I just come back to when I was looking

8 at all the cases and looking at the treaty and the text of

9 the convention, you always do have to look to the injury-

10 producing event because the text of the treaty says an

11 accident which causes the damage. And I think it does

12 come down to showing what is the direct event.

13 I think when you look at the Krys case, I think

14 the Court -- the Eleventh Circuit in Krys clearly set

15 forth, I think, a very workable standard. They say let's

16 look at the -- we ask let's look at the precise event. We

17 look at what were the precise events that caused this

18 injury, not the actions of the air carrier that they could

19 have taken to avert that injury.

20 QUESTION: But was it determined here that the

21 passenger died from smoke exposure?

22 MR. HARAKAS: There was at the -- there was a --

23 a legal finding that it was the smoke that killed the

24 passenger even though --

25 QUESTION: And do we take the case on that

1 understanding?

2 MR. HARAKAS: You would have to take the case on
3 the understanding because we didn't raise the factual
4 issue that he would have died from the food poisoning.

5 QUESTION: And is it the case that there would
6 have been seats possibly available more removed from the
7 smoke so that it wouldn't have been as heavy an exposure
8 to smoke?

9 MR. HARAKAS: I don't -- I don't think there was
10 any evidence to establish the concentrations of the
11 cigarette smoke. There were seats that were further
12 removed, but then you come down to, again, factual issues
13 or determinations as to, well, how far do you remove the
14 passenger. Is three further rows further ahead, five rows
15 further ahead enough?

16 QUESTION: But here there was a total refusal
17 to --

18 MR. HARAKAS: There was a -- well, there was
19 a --

20 QUESTION: -- to provide any help.

21 MR. HARAKAS: There was a refusal to -- there
22 was a refusal to move him because the flight attendant
23 believed the flight was full, and it was, other than the
24 10 seats. But the -- the flight attendant did give this
25 passenger the option to reseat himself.

1 QUESTION: Well, you -- you say you have to
2 consider just very precisely what caused the injury. What
3 is your view here of what caused the injury?

4 MR. HARAKAS: What caused the injury was his
5 exposure to the cigarette smoke under the facts of this
6 case and on the findings. And then we have to determine
7 was cigarette smoke in that area, ambient cigarette smoke,
8 unusual, unexpected, and even the lower court found that
9 cigarette smoke on a smoking aircraft is not an unusual,
10 unexpected event.

11 QUESTION: When you say the -- the airline gave
12 the passenger the option to reseat himself, wasn't it the
13 option to -- to request another passenger to change seats
14 with him?

15 MR. HARAKAS: To change seats with him

16 QUESTION: Yes.

17 MR. HARAKAS: Or he could have -- what the -- or
18 he could have moved through the cabin to see if he could
19 locate an empty seat.

20 But mind you, the flight attendant never had any
21 direct communications with Dr. Hanson. It was always
22 through his wife. There were two requests made to move on
23 initial boarding.

24 QUESTION: Well, but does that make -- does that
25 make any difference in -- in this case, the fact that his

1 wife was speaking for him?

2 MR. HARAKAS: No. I mean, it would have made a
3 difference in the lower court as to the issue of
4 reasonableness and things like that, but for purpose of
5 the legal issue before the Court, no, it doesn't make a
6 difference because, again, when you look at -- when you
7 look at all the various cases, when you come through Krys,
8 Abramson, and the other pre-Tseng cases -- and I draw that
9 distinction before Tseng -- the courts universally had
10 held that a passenger's injury arising out of his own
11 internal reaction to the conditions on the aircraft is not
12 an accident.

13 And when you look to the history of the
14 convention itself, here the lower courts, in effect --
15 while we say they didn't use negligence, they, in effect,
16 imported concepts of negligence, reasonableness,
17 reasonable alternatives, things like that, those types of
18 concepts.

19 QUESTION: How about other courts? I mean, we
20 do look to see what our treaty partners do in this area.
21 The two other courts that were cited in the brief that
22 addressed this question seem to agree with the decision of
23 the Ninth Circuit in this case.

24 MR. HARAKAS: Yes. Yes, Justice Ginsburg. The
25 one court was an Australian court in Povi, a lower court

1 case, which that case has been appealed and argued on
2 appeal. And that case -- that was in the DVT context. I
3 think that court suffered from the same fundamental errors
4 that the courts here below did in viewing what the --

5 QUESTION: What about the court of appeals in
6 England --

7 MR. HARAKAS: -- that --

8 QUESTION: -- that disagreed on the -- on the --
9 whatever that --

10 MR. HARAKAS: Yes, the DVT litigation.

11 QUESTION: Disagreed on that, but did say, went
12 out of its way to say, it thought that this case was the
13 right way to go about it.

14 MR. HARAKAS: Well, the -- on the DVT litigation
15 case, the court found that -- he disagreed with the
16 reasoning of the lower courts, but he said that he could
17 certainly understand the result. But he was, again,
18 focusing in on the facts because if you applied the --

19 QUESTION: Well, that's surely dictum anyway. I
20 mean --

21 MR. HARAKAS: Yes, well --

22 QUESTION: -- the dictum in that case that --
23 that he thought that this case came out right below. We
24 wouldn't even -- we wouldn't even give dispositive effect
25 to our own dictum much less to the dictum of a court of

1 appeals in England.

2 MR. HARAKAS: You're -- you're right, Justice
3 Scalia. It was dicta. And what happened was in that
4 case, I think he had a misperception of the facts at the
5 end of the day, and if you applied the rationale that he
6 used for his opinion in dismissing those cases, the facts
7 of this case would inevitably lead to the dismissal of
8 this case and a finding of no accident.

9 QUESTION: I don't think so, having read his
10 decision and the other members of the court of appeals.

11 QUESTION: What was Lord Phillips'
12 misperception?

13 MR. HARAKAS: As to the enforced exposure to the
14 cigarette smoke because -- because the passenger here was
15 given the option to relocate, and he could have relocated
16 himself.

17 QUESTION: The option being -- the option being
18 the one that was mentioned a moment ago. Your husband can
19 get up and try to get somebody else to move?

20 MR. HARAKAS: Switch or find another -- one of
21 the available empty seats. Because then you also have to
22 remember, again, I -- well, I don't want to get into
23 the --

24 QUESTION: She -- she said positively there are
25 no empty seats. The -- the option that was given to the

1 wife was that you go ask another passenger to switch
2 seats.

3 MR. HARAKAS: Sure, because -- because at the
4 time, you know, there were only 11 empty seats, and she
5 said that the plane is full. And that -- and that's at
6 the time of boarding as well, in the middle of boarding.
7 It's a flight that had been delayed for 3 hours.
8 Everybody is coming on board the plane.

9 QUESTION: But by the time the second and third
10 inquiries were asked, it should have been evident that
11 there were empty seats.

12 MR. HARAKAS: Well, the -- the second inquiry
13 was just before -- shortly before takeoff on -- on a
14 flight delayed for 3 hours, and they're trying to take
15 off, and she says, I can't help you right now. And one
16 thing -- and then the third one was shortly after takeoff.

17 QUESTION: Well, but the -- I wouldn't think
18 they allowed smoking before takeoff.

19 MR. HARAKAS: No, they did not allow smoking
20 before takeoff. It wasn't until the third incident
21 shortly after takeoff when smoking was allowed, and then
22 she said, can you please move my husband now? And the
23 request was denied.

24 But I think with -- with respect to the whole
25 accident inquiry issue here, we also have to look to, when

1 you start bringing in the definition of what is an
2 accident, when you start equating with issues of
3 negligence and common law, I think we go astray and go
4 contrary to what the drafters intended as to what the
5 Court here in Tseng held, that you don't -- accident is
6 not a common law concept. It's a self-contained --

7 QUESTION: If Tseng had held nothing on this
8 point, in fact, it -- it said that the Second Circuit's
9 conclusion that that wasn't an accident was doubtful. In
10 Tseng, it was an academic question. What barred her from
11 getting recovery under the treaty was she didn't suffer
12 from a physical injury or from a psychological injury with
13 -- with physical manifestations. She didn't die and she
14 didn't have the kind of injury that would qualify. Tseng
15 -- I think you are quite wrong in saying that that
16 decision passed on the concept of accident.

17 MR. HARAKAS: No. I agree with you, Justice
18 Ginsburg. I may have misspoke because you're absolutely
19 right. There was only that one footnote that -- where the
20 Court did express concern as to whether the court in the
21 Second Circuit flexibly applied the Tseng decision. But I
22 was talking about the -- what I meant was the broader
23 context of Tseng with respect to importation or allowing a
24 parallel state cause of action in light of the exclusivity
25 of the convention and the uniformity principles set forth

1 in the convention.

2 And if you start importing concepts of
3 negligence back into the convention -- because, in effect,
4 what the courts are doing below is they're saying, fine,
5 we can't go to State law, but what we'll do is we'll --
6 we'll define an accident to make it equivalent to a
7 negligence cause of action. So there's really no
8 difference. What the courts are doing is nullifying the
9 exclusivity holding by equating any act of negligence as
10 an accident.

11 QUESTION: But are -- are you saying here that
12 the court of appeals really wrote an opinion about -- in
13 negligence and saying that's an accident?

14 MR. HARAKAS: When you read the --, the language
15 of the court of appeals, it's -- it's pure negligence
16 language.

17 QUESTION: But -- but it seems to me whatever
18 you think about what the flight attendant did, it -- it
19 can't be classed as negligence here. It was a refusal to
20 do something.

21 MR. HARAKAS: It was a refusal. It was a -- it
22 was a -- in my view, it was an omission, and I think at --
23 when you take omissions and put it in the context of what
24 is -- is that an unusual, unexpected event, that an
25 omission cannot in and of itself be the accident.

1 QUESTION: I don't know if we really have to get
2 into the act versus omission question here because this
3 was more than that. It was a refusal to take action in
4 the face of an alleged severe medical problem and in -- in
5 contravention to the rules of the airline at the time. So
6 you could characterize this, I think, as some kind of
7 positive action, in effect.

8 MR. HARAKAS: Well, I -- when I think of an
9 event, I think of some type of positive action, and in
10 this instance, when -- when I look at a refusal to do
11 something, I look at it as -- as an omission.

12 But even if you did look at it as a positive
13 event here, Justice O'Connor, I think you -- although --
14 everything leads us back to trying to identify was the
15 event that caused the injury here unusual, unexpected.
16 And that -- there's only one injury-producing event. For
17 example, let's say nobody asked the airline in this case
18 to move Dr. Hanson. There was no request made, and he
19 remained in his non-smoking seat.

20 QUESTION: No request made? I thought the wife
21 made a request.

22 MR. HARAKAS: I'm sorry.

23 QUESTION: Excuse me.

24 MR. HARAKAS: A hypothetical.

25 QUESTION: Oh.

1 MR. HARAKAS: Let's assume no request had been
2 made, and he would have remained in that same non-smoking
3 seat and he would have died because of the exposure to the
4 ambient cigarette smoke, according to plaintiffs' theory.
5 What would be the injury-producing event there? What
6 caused that death? His internal reaction to the cigarette
7 smoke, the normal -- which was normal and expected.

8 Now, the fact that they asked -- somebody asked
9 for him to be moved doesn't change the injury-producing
10 event. The injury-producing event is the same. It's the
11 exposure to the cigarette smoke.

12 QUESTION: Well, but of course, the exposure
13 might have been substantially reduced if the passenger had
14 been able to get seated in an area further removed from
15 the active smokers.

16 MR. HARAKAS: There -- he still would have had
17 -- there still would have been ambient cigarette smoke
18 throughout the cabin, as we all well know.

19 QUESTION: Well, suppose there were five rows of
20 empty seats in front and a -- a stewardess -- and there
21 are stewardesses like this sometimes that we don't people
22 wandering around the plane. We're serving food. You must
23 sit down in your seat. A different case?

24 MR. HARAKAS: No, not a different case because
25 you are assigned to your assigned seat, and again, it's

1 one of those extreme examples that if I believed there
2 were five empty rows here, he probably would have gotten
3 up and found it himself. But in that case, I don't feel
4 there would be a different case because, again, I -- I
5 focus in on this injury-producing event here, and the
6 injury-producing event is the exposure to cigarette smoke
7 which was normal and expected.

8 QUESTION: So your -- your submission is if the
9 airline requires you to sit in the no-smoking seat for no
10 particularly good reason, there's still no accident.

11 MR. HARAKAS: Oh, I -- I disagree on that one
12 because if they required you to sit in a non-smoking seat
13 and you had --

14 QUESTION: Well, that was my hypothetical.

15 MR. HARAKAS: Okay. If they -- if you -- if
16 they require you to sit in a smoking section?

17 QUESTION: No. One -- just one -- one row
18 ahead.

19 MR. HARAKAS: There would be no difference in
20 the situation from this -- from our scenario. There still
21 would not be an accident. He was assigned a non-smoking
22 seat and you -- again, you look to was his own internal
23 reaction here to the normal and expected operation of the
24 aircraft.

25 And I think when -- when you look at the

1 convention, the structure of the convention, and what they
2 had in mind by the term accident, you have to -- you can
3 only come back to that one basic conclusion, that you look
4 to what is that injury-producing event.

5 I'd like just to reserve the remaining -- my
6 time for rebuttal if there are no further questions.

7 QUESTION: Very well, Mr. Harakas.

8 Mr. Farr, we'll hear from you.

9 ORAL ARGUMENT OF H. BARTOW FARR, III

10 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

11 MR. FARR: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please
12 the Court:

13 There are basically two reasons why we think
14 that article 17 imposes liability when an airline
15 knowingly leaves a passenger in medical jeopardy without
16 taking basic measures to alleviate the harm

17 First, because that kind of action violates
18 normal industry safety practices and thus, under Saks --

19 QUESTION: Well, that's the question. Is it an
20 accident? You assume it. You say that kind of accident.
21 Well, I think that's the issue. Is it an accident?

22 MR. FARR: I'm sorry if I said that kind of -- I
23 meant to say that kind of action under Saks is contrary to
24 -- to the normal industry safety practices.

25 QUESTION: Let me ask about Saks. It's -- it

1 seems to me that the fallacy in the argument that -- that
2 you -- you run and that the Government runs is that it
3 accepts the language of Saks as the totality of what is
4 necessary to be an accident.

5 Now, Saks involved a fellow who had some problem
6 with his ear which was -- caused him harm because of the
7 normal depressor -- pressurization of the -- of the
8 cockpit. And in denying relief under the -- under the
9 convention, the Court says, no, that wasn't an accident
10 because the cockpits are pressurized all the time, and if
11 it -- it has -- to be an accident, it has to be an
12 unexpected or unusual event or happening. Okay.

13 Saks was not saying that that is a sufficient
14 condition to be an accident. It was just saying that that
15 is a necessary condition.

16 Now, let me -- let me give -- give you a
17 hypothetical and you tell me why -- why this would be an
18 accident. It seems to me the hypothetical closely
19 parallels what happened here.

20 A man hurls himself into the sea intending to
21 commit suicide. There is right nearby to where he hurled
22 himself into the sea a dock with 30 people on it and 30
23 life preservers at their feet, and not a single one of
24 them picks up the life preserver and throws it to the
25 drowning man. I don't know why. Maybe they're 30

1 libertarians who think people should be able to kill
2 themselves. Whatever.

3 (Laughter.)

4 QUESTION: Certainly -- certainly an unexpected
5 and unusual event. Who would imagine that with 30 life
6 preservers within reach of the man, nobody would throw
7 one.

8 Now, would anybody in his right mind say that
9 this man died because of an accident? Of course, not.
10 Unexpected and unanticipated is a -- a necessary condition
11 for -- for saying that something was caused by an
12 accident, but it's surely not a sufficient condition.

13 And it seems to me what happened in this plane
14 is exactly like that. It is an event after the person was
15 endangered. I -- I don't think that this person died
16 because of an accident. It just doesn't make it. And
17 that's the language of the convention, not Saks.

18 MR. FARR: Well, Justice Scalia, it seems to me
19 that -- that the point that you're making, which in one
20 sense I think is a correct one, is that the language of --
21 of article 17, if one looks at it in purely colloquial
22 terms, may not exactly correspond with the definition in
23 Saks. But the language in article 17 isn't used -- the
24 term accident isn't used purely in the colloquial sense.
25 What we know from the context of the convention as a whole

1 and the liability system as a whole and from Saks is that
2 sometimes it actually captures less than the colloquial
3 sense of the term accident, sometimes it's more.

4 For example, the mere fact that somebody has a
5 heart attack typically would be, in the colloquial sense,
6 thought of as an accident. But we've learned from Saks
7 that it is not itself going to be considered the accident
8 because of the context of article 17 and the -- the
9 language about accidents causing death or bodily injury.

10 By the same token, the deliberate refusal to
11 help somebody, as the Chief Justice pointed out in his --
12 his earlier question I think, is -- is normally, in
13 colloquial terms, not thought of as an accident. It's not
14 inadvertent. It's deliberate. But we know under article
15 17 that deliberate conduct can, in fact, be an accident.
16 If a flight strikes a passenger in the face or throws
17 coffee on the passenger in a fit of rage, that is an
18 accident for purposes of article 17.

19 QUESTION: I'm willing to say that negligent
20 conduct such as occurred here can be an accident. Of
21 course, it can. If -- if the flight attendant spills some
22 hot liquid on the passenger causing the passenger to be
23 scalded, of course, that -- that's an accident.

24 MR. FARR: Well, Justice Scalia --

25 QUESTION: That fits the normal -- the normal

1 concept of accident.

2 MR. FARR: Of course, but -- but --

3 QUESTION: What happened here does not fit the
4 normal description of accident.

5 MR. FARR: But my example is not a -- an
6 accidental spilling. I'm -- I'm actually talking about it
7 just to try to get at the colloquial sense, which I think
8 is what disturbs you, that -- that if -- if in fact the --
9 the flight attendant purposely throws the coffee on the
10 passenger, just become irritated with the passenger, that
11 would not normally be thought of as an accident, if you're
12 asking people around the coffee shop whether there's been
13 an accident.

14 But in terms of article 17, it is an accident
15 because we know article 17 covers instances of willful
16 misconduct. Article 17 is the gateway by which you get to
17 any liability, and willful misconduct includes certainly
18 the kinds of -- of things that I'm talking about,
19 deliberate conduct.

20 QUESTION: Can this be said to be that kind of
21 conduct where it's contrary to the policy of the airline?

22 MR. FARR: Yes, it can, Justice O'Connor. I
23 mean, one of the things that's a little bit curious in --
24 in tying the two questions together with Justice Scalia's
25 question, this is a -- this is an incident which in fact

1 is to some extent intentional.

2 QUESTION: Yes.

3 MR. FARR: I mean, the -- it was not inadvertent
4 that -- that the passenger was left in his seat. For
5 example, just -- just to take a different, slightly
6 changed analogy, if in fact the passenger had -- had asked
7 to be moved in -- out of the vicinity of the smoke, and
8 the flight attendant had said, let me wait until everybody
9 is seated, I'll come back and get you in half an hour, and
10 she forgot to do that, that would actually in colloquial
11 terms seem more like an accident. Somehow negligently she
12 forgot to come back. But in fact, in this particular
13 case, she was asked three times and knowing in fact what
14 she was doing, she said, no, I'm not going to move you.

15 QUESTION: What if she -- what if she'd been
16 asked to move him, and she said I'll be back, and then
17 another passenger gets very ill and she has to take care
18 of him right away, and then the facts are the same.
19 Accident there?

20 MR. FARR: The question then I think -- the --
21 the proper way to answer that, Justice Kennedy, is to look
22 at what would happen in the normal flight under the normal
23 circumstances. Obviously, under the circumstances we had
24 here, it's unusual and unexpected that she didn't move
25 him. If in fact the reason was that there was some other

1 enormous problem on the plane and all of the flight
2 attendants had to deal with that particular problem, then
3 it seems to me the -- the action here would not be unusual
4 and unexpected.

5 QUESTION: Well, that's --

6 QUESTION: Your -- you stated in your opening
7 that the airline's conduct here was contrary to industry
8 policy, and I think Justice O'Connor premised an earlier
9 question on saying it was against the policy of -- of this
10 particular airline. Spell that out a little, will you?
11 What was the policy of -- of the airline and why did this
12 action violate it?

13 MR. FARR: The policy of the airline and the
14 policy generally, because I think they're in this case the
15 same --

16 QUESTION: They're the same.

17 MR. FARR: -- was when a passenger requests a
18 move for medical reasons, that the policy is to
19 accommodate that request if it's possible to do so. And
20 it was possible here because there were empty seats in the
21 coach cabin, so we don't have to get into the complicated
22 questions of whether you have to move someone to first
23 class or to -- to alleviate the problem

24 QUESTION: Would -- would it have been any more
25 or less of an accident if that practice had not prevailed

1 in the industry?

2 MR. FARR: I think it's possible that it would.
3 I mean, I -- our position is not that essentially the
4 industry can give itself immunity by lowering its
5 standards so much that -- that acts that -- that clearly
6 are unusual, but nonetheless within the -- the industry
7 standard are -- are immune from liability. But I think
8 the general idea is in trying to evaluate things that
9 aren't obviously accidents, we have to have some sort of
10 benchmark to judge whether what's happened is unusual.
11 The natural place is to look -- is -- is at the industry
12 practice. And if in fact what they've done is consistent
13 with industry practice, I would think in the usual case
14 certainly that would suggest there hasn't been an unusual
15 event.

16 QUESTION: Well, but it was unusual here.

17 MR. FARR: Absolutely.

18 QUESTION: So why isn't this an accident in the
19 same sense that having an attendant throw hot coffee on a
20 passenger would be?

21 MR. FARR: It is.

22 QUESTION: Supposing the airline's defense to
23 throwing hot coffee on the passenger said our stewardesses
24 do that all the time.

25 (Laughter.)

1 QUESTION: There's unexpected about it.

2 MR. FARR: I mean, the -- the fact is as I say,
3 that I don't think that necessarily having a very low
4 standard in the company itself or in the industry will, in
5 fact, give you immunity, although I have to say I think
6 that in fact that's an unlikely thing to happen because
7 when we talk about the Warsaw Convention, there's a
8 natural --

9 QUESTION: Mr. Farr, can I interrupt for a
10 second? It seems to me that in the question of whether
11 you move a passenger or not, you could have a situation
12 which for security reasons, as they have around
13 Washington, every passenger must remain in his or her --
14 her seat for 500 miles or 30 minutes or so, and refusal to
15 move during that period could not possibly be an accident.

16 MR. FARR: That's correct, Justice Stevens. I
17 think -- but -- but the analysis would be the same. I
18 mean, one of the instructions that Saks gives, I think
19 correctly, is that you have to look at all the
20 circumstances. What is unusual or unexpected under
21 certain circumstances would not be unusual or expected --
22 unexpected under other circumstances like the one --

23 QUESTION: What -- what role does fault play?
24 It -- it seemed to me, as I was reading the Ninth Circuit
25 opinion in Saks, that negligence is probably not a

1 requisite. I don't know if that makes it necessary for us
2 to send it back. Suppose we think that's true. Would we
3 send it back to the court of appeals and say, no, no,
4 negligence is -- is not the standard, go ahead and find
5 fault on their -- or whether or not there's an accident
6 under some other standard?

7 MR. FARR: Justice Kennedy, I -- I don't think
8 that's necessary. I mean, what the Ninth Circuit
9 basically said was this is an unusual or unexpected event
10 under Saks because it violates industry policies, industry
11 standards, the company policy, and particularly given the
12 nature of the request. If the Ninth Circuit had stopped
13 there, it seems to me that their decision would be
14 absolutely correct.

15 QUESTION: Well, it didn't. It went on and got
16 a bunch of negligence language in there.

17 MR. FARR: Well, it's the following sentence
18 that obviously raises at least some questions. And I
19 should say I'm not sure that -- that language in itself
20 should be as troubling as it perhaps appears to some
21 because the -- the situations that -- that the court
22 describes there very often will be, it seems to me,
23 unusual or unexpected situations.

24 But nonetheless, it seems to me that -- that
25 following the adage that the Court sits to review

1 judgments and not opinions, that the Court can simply say,
2 as we -- we suggest would be sufficient, that you do have
3 an unusual and unexpected event when you fail to help a
4 passenger in violation of the standard industry practice.

5 Now, if the standard industry practice would be
6 not to help a passenger under certain circumstances and
7 the claim is still made that it's unusual or unexpected,
8 one would need another benchmark for reference, but the
9 Court doesn't need to reach that in this case.

10 Now, I would like to -- to also point out that
11 in -- in -- when we're talking about the language of -- of
12 article 17, while I think it's -- it's proper to -- to
13 focus on the language itself and discuss it in -- in the
14 context of Saks, that it's also I think proper to look at
15 the context of the convention as a whole and whether, in
16 fact, competing interpretations of the term accident would
17 lead to absurd consequences.

18 Here I think if in fact the definition or the
19 application of the definition that Olympic tries to -- to
20 urge on the Court is accepted, that one is going to find
21 that -- that this convention, which is intended to be the
22 exclusive means of remedy for passengers who suffer death
23 or bodily injury on an international flight, is -- is
24 going to have essentially a hole in it where it doesn't
25 cover situations even, as in this case, whether it's

1 willful misconduct by the airline crew that causes the
2 injury.

3 And the focus that -- you know, in terms of
4 whether that is a reasonable understanding to attribute to
5 the parties to the convention under the circumstances, it
6 seems to me when you -- when you say a positive act would
7 be an accident, an omission that would cause an accident
8 would be -- you know, would -- would involve an accident,
9 but there's liability whatsoever for situations in which
10 the -- the conduct itself is the contributing factor, the
11 failure to do something is the -- is a strong contributing
12 factor, doesn't really make any reasonable sense as a
13 construction, and particularly because one of the things
14 that the -- the parties must have understood is that
15 during the time that the passenger is -- is covered by
16 article 17, if you will, from the time of embarkation to
17 the time of disembarkation, the passenger is largely in
18 the control of the airline. The airline determines where
19 the passenger sits. So the passenger's opportunities to
20 engage in self-help are greatly reduced.

21 And in that situation, the idea that the -- that
22 the parties thought that airlines could simply say we have
23 passengers on our plane who need our help for medical
24 reasons, and we're not going to provide any help
25 whatsoever and that either causes greater injury -- causes

1 injury in the first place, causes greater injury, or in an
2 unhappy case like this one, actually causes a death, their
3 theory would say there's still no liability. And it would
4 seem to me you would need a very, very clear indication
5 from the text, which doesn't exist here, to reach that
6 result.

7 QUESTION: Well, what if someone suffered, say,
8 a heart attack on the plane and it was 3 hours from its
9 destination and the doctor there said, you know, you've
10 really got to -- in -- in order to avoid this guy probably
11 dying, you're going to have to land somewhere en route?
12 Now, would an airline be obligated to do that in order to
13 avoid this sort of accident?

14 MR. FARR: It depends on the circumstances, but
15 I think the general industry practice would be, in fact,
16 that an airline would be -- would -- would normally divert
17 to a nearer airport in fact to -- to save the -- the
18 passenger from death or from much more severe injury.

19 That in a sense is the Krys case, the Eleventh
20 Circuit case, that Olympic says is in conflict with the
21 decision in this case. That was a case in which the
22 Eleventh Circuit said, well, the -- the failure to divert,
23 which it -- it was agreed would -- would have made a
24 significant difference to the passenger's health, was not
25 unusual because the plane just did the normal thing. It

1 just flew to its regular destination. But the problem
2 with Krys is that if you look at all the circumstances, as
3 Saks says, it's not the normal thing just to fly on to
4 your intended destination when a passenger has had a heart
5 attack and the medical indication --

6 QUESTION: Well, then -- then you're saying
7 basically it depends on airline practice whether something
8 is expected or unexpected and whether it's the normal
9 practice.

10 MR. FARR: In this context. I mean, obviously,
11 sometimes it's -- it's -- if -- if the context is the --
12 the failure to help a passenger in -- in medical distress,
13 then it seems to me that the usual practice of -- of the
14 airline or the industry in general is -- is the proper
15 benchmark, at least initially, for determining whether
16 something is usual or unusual.

17 Now, obviously, there are other kinds of
18 accidents, crashes and hijackings and all, where -- where
19 common knowledge tells you what happened is unusual, but
20 where common knowledge doesn't necessarily tell you the
21 answer, then it does seem that reference to industry
22 standards is a useful benchmark.

23 QUESTION: Would you comment on the distinction
24 between an event and an accident?

25 MR. FARR: Well, the event is under -- under

1 Saks -- I mean, the difference is that an accident has to
2 be an unusual event, that not every event is an accident.
3 You have to demonstrate that it's unusual, and -- and much
4 of what we've talked about this morning, obviously, is --
5 is why this would be unusual by reference to industry
6 standards. But an event, if one looks at a dictionary
7 definition, is simply something that happened on the
8 plane.

9 QUESTION: I think it would affect the liability
10 for loss of baggage and so forth. That's triggered by an
11 event, as I understand it.

12 MR. FARR: That's correct. It is now. It was
13 at one time triggered by an occurrence, and under the 1999
14 Montreal Convention it's triggered by an event. Yes.

15 QUESTION: Do you think the Abramson case in the
16 Third Circuit was properly decided?

17 MR. FARR: I don't -- I am not sure the result
18 was wrong. I don't think the approach was correct. I
19 think the court should have asked what the usual industry
20 practice would have been in that case, and if the usual
21 industry practice would have been to make an accommodation
22 along the lines that -- that the passenger requested, then
23 I think that might have well have been an accident. I
24 think it's a -- it's a difficult question as to whether
25 that would have been true because that particular

1 passenger needed to be moved into first class, needed two
2 first class seats, and in fact part of the solution was he
3 was perhaps going to introduce self-induced vomiting as a
4 cure, which obviously would affect other passengers in the
5 cabin. So, you know, on the facts, one ultimately might
6 have said -- the -- the judgment that was made there
7 actually comported with -- with the usual industry
8 standards. However, we don't know the answer because the
9 Third Circuit didn't ask the right question.

10 QUESTION: But you do think the Eleventh Circuit
11 Krys case was wrong in both reasoning and result.

12 MR. FARR: Well, Krys -- we have an additional
13 piece of information because the court went on to decide
14 the case. This was pre Tseng. So it actually decided the
15 case as a common law negligence case, and when it did so,
16 it found that what the airline had done by not diverting
17 in that particular case was a violation of industry
18 standards. So in that case I think what should have
19 happened in Krys is that the court should have made that
20 inquiry as part of the Warsaw Convention analysis, and if
21 it had done so in fact, it would have limited the recovery
22 in Krys, which was many millions of dollars, to the limits
23 of the Warsaw Convention, supplemented by the agreements.

24 If the Court has no further questions, thank
25 you.

1 QUESTION: Thank you, Mr. Farr.

2 Ms. McDowell, we'll hear from you.

3 ORAL ARGUMENT OF BARBARA B. McDOWELL

4 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES,

5 AS AMICUS CURIAE, SUPPORTING THE RESPONDENTS

6 MS. McDOWELL: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
7 please the Court:

8 A flight attendant's refusal to assist an ill
9 passenger can amount to an accident within the meaning of
10 the Warsaw Convention. The analysis focuses on whether
11 such conduct is, objectively speaking, unusual or
12 unexpected, taking into account the ordinary practices in
13 the industry and other indicia of what would be expected
14 in the circumstances.

15 At a minimum it's reasonable to construe the
16 convention's term accident, as the United States construes
17 it, to encompass the aberrant conduct of the flight crew,
18 and this Court has ordinarily accorded weight to the
19 United States' reasonable construction of treaties to
20 which it is a party.

21 Our reading of the term accident comports with
22 the text structure and purposes of the convention. The
23 term is a broad and inclusive one. It's not confined to
24 crashes or explosions or equipment failures. As the Court
25 recognized in Saks, it can encompass a wide array of

1 unusual and unexpected events external to the passenger
2 potentially --

3 QUESTION: Ms. McDowell --

4 MS. McDOWELL: Yes.

5 QUESTION: -- assuming that it could have
6 happened somehow in an airline context, would you say that
7 Justice Scalia's hypothetical was an accident?

8 MS. McDOWELL: I think that a failure of an
9 airline employee to come to the assistance of a passenger
10 can, indeed, be an accident. One must recall that even
11 under the common law, common carriers such as airlines
12 have been understood to have special obligations toward
13 their passengers, not expansive obligations to act as
14 physicians to them, but to provide reasonable first aid
15 until they reach the destination. So I think that -- that
16 this particular context is -- is quite different from the
17 context when one is dealing with just a bystander.

18 And I think under the common law as well, there
19 have been other situations that might well be viewed as
20 accidents that involved omissions when one is under a duty
21 to act.

22 QUESTION: Okay. Let's say it wasn't a
23 bystander. Let's say that, you know, they were -- they
24 were relatives. They're the parents of -- of the person
25 who jumped. You still wouldn't call that an accident,

1 would you? Does it have anything to do with -- with
2 whether there's a duty or not? Some States do impose a
3 duty on -- on bystanders, by the way, and let's assume
4 that happens in a State where there is a duty.

5 MS. McDOWELL: Well, I think the inquiry here --

6 QUESTION: You still wouldn't call it an
7 accident, I don't think. I mean, nobody would use the
8 English language that way.

9 MS. McDOWELL: Well, I think here under the
10 Warsaw Convention, the term accident has been understood
11 to refer to an unusual, unexpected event.

12 QUESTION: Okay. But wouldn't you -- Warsaw
13 Convention or not, wouldn't you call it an accident if the
14 bystanders had put up an advertisement saying, swim with
15 us for \$500, and then they stood there?

16 MS. McDOWELL: Yes, that would -- that would
17 seem to be an accident.

18 QUESTION: That would get a little closer to our
19 situation, wouldn't it? And that --

20 MS. McDOWELL: Yes, Your Honor.

21 QUESTION: -- and that might well be an
22 accident.

23 MS. McDOWELL: Other circumstances -- medical
24 malpractice cases, for example, might be those where an
25 omission of some sort, because the doctor is under a duty

1 to act, could be viewed as an accident. For example, a
2 failure to diagnose or to treat a particular medical
3 condition until it's too late, if that was negligent,
4 could be an accident.

5 QUESTION: Would -- would you say that we ought
6 to write the opinion so that if there is negligence, that
7 is evidence that normal airline practices were not being
8 followed, and that's an accident? So that negligence is
9 important to the analysis, not necessary, but it -- it can
10 be helpful.

11 MS. McDOWELL: We would say that --

12 QUESTION: Or -- or should we write the opinion
13 without talking about negligence?

14 MS. McDOWELL: We would say that the test is
15 objective reasonableness which connotes some of the same
16 concepts as negligence does in the common law.

17 QUESTION: Well, how does -- how does that
18 differ from -- from the common law at all? If you say
19 objective reasonableness, you're really just changing
20 accident into common law negligence, aren't you?

21 MS. McDOWELL: Well, not in all circumstances
22 because negligence isn't a necessary condition for an
23 accident to occur. An accident could be an act of God and
24 an event that did not involve negligence.

25 In this particular case, yes, the inquiry into

1 due care and the inquiry into an -- whether an accident
2 has occurred are quite similar, but they're still focused
3 on a different question. The accident inquiry asks
4 whether something unusual or unexpected has happened, and
5 the due care inquiry under article 20 asks whether the
6 airline has acted with due care.

7 QUESTION: Well, negligence is a proxy for the
8 fact that normal airline operating rules were not being
9 followed.

10 MS. McDOWELL: Correct. Now, there may be
11 isolated instances where although ordinary practices were
12 being followed, those practices were so deficient that,
13 nonetheless, an accident might be found. Normally,
14 however, I think that -- that airlines' practices are to
15 treat passengers reasonably. So I think that asking the
16 reasonableness question would be the same as -- as seeing
17 whether there was a deviation from standard policies and
18 practices.

19 In construing the --

20 QUESTION: You know, I think there may be a
21 public policy reason for construing accident contrary to
22 its normal meaning to embrace in this context intentional
23 acts whether by the airline employees or by pirates or --
24 or terrorists or anybody else. But I don't -- I -- there
25 -- there's a problem in my mind about interpreting it to

1 -- to embrace especially negligent omissions. It seems to
2 me that's so far away from the normal meaning of accident
3 that I don't -- I don't see the justification for doing it
4 especially where it converts the convention into
5 essentially what it was not intended to be, liability for
6 negligence. That --

7 MS. McDOWELL: Well, of course, in this case we
8 don't have a mere negligent omission. We have what the
9 district court found to be willful misconduct. We also
10 found -- this case also involves a -- a refusal to act, a
11 series of refusals to act, and -- and provision of
12 misinformation about whether the flight was completely
13 full or not. So it's -- it's difficult to characterize
14 this particular case --

15 QUESTION: No, the misinformation didn't bear
16 any causality. I mean, the -- the -- what caused the
17 injury here was -- was not the misrepresentation about the
18 other seats. It was simply the failure to move the person
19 to another seat, and that is totally an -- an omission, it
20 seems to me.

21 MS. McDOWELL: I don't think it's properly
22 characterized as an omission when there were three
23 increasingly desperate requests to reseat the passenger
24 and the flight attendant responded on each occasion --

25 QUESTION: I take it back. Three -- three

1 omissions.

2 MS. McDOWELL: I think that this sort of case
3 can be contrasted, for example, from a -- a simple failure
4 to warn case where the question is whether an airline
5 should have warned about a particular medical condition
6 that a passenger might have in response to ordinary
7 flight. This seems to involve much more. Certainly Lord
8 Phillips in the English court of appeals thought that this
9 case involved much more than -- than just a failure to
10 act.

11 The drafters of the Warsaw Convention certainly
12 didn't intend that airlines would be insurers for any harm
13 that befell a passenger during flight. They did intend,
14 however, that airlines would be held liable when their own
15 fault caused a passenger's death or bodily injury.
16 Indeed, they eliminated the caps on damages in cases when
17 that fault rose to the level of willful misconduct. This
18 would seem doubtful that the drafters intended simply by
19 their choice of the term accident to exempt airlines
20 entirely from liability in cases where passengers died or
21 suffered bodily injury because of the airline's fault,
22 including willful misconduct in this case.

23 QUESTION: Well, is airline's fault even
24 required? Supposing that before the plane took off, there
25 was a big fire in the area and smoke filled the -- filled

1 the aircraft while it was on the runway and then he died
2 from that smoke, would that be an accident?

3 MS. McDOWELL: It could well be an accident,
4 Your Honor. It might not be an accident for which
5 liability would -- would be properly --

6 QUESTION: Why wouldn't it be?

7 QUESTION: There's going to be an accident
8 within the meaning of the convention is what I'm asking
9 you.

10 MS. McDOWELL: Yes, it probably would.

11 QUESTION: So then the smoke doesn't have -- the
12 -- the -- whatever the accidental cause is, it doesn't
13 have to be fault of the airline.

14 MS. McDOWELL: That's correct because the
15 airlines have the opportunity under article 20 of the
16 convention to come back and say that we cannot be held
17 responsible for this accident because we did not act
18 negligently.

19 The understanding --

20 QUESTION: I thought they had to show more than
21 that. I thought they had to show that they did everything
22 possible to prevent -- to prevent the --

23 MS. McDOWELL: Well, the term in the treaty is
24 all necessary measures.

25 QUESTION: Yes.

1 MS. McDOWELL: But it's been construed to mean
2 all reasonable measures. So it's essentially been
3 understood as a -- a due care defense. And that's
4 reinforced in the Montreal Convention, the new convention
5 that has just come into force, that -- that uses the term
6 negligence in its own words.

7 The understanding that the accident requirement
8 can be satisfied in cases like this one serves the
9 convention's purpose of balancing the interests of air
10 carriers and passengers. Such cases do not pose a threat
11 of particularly expansive liability to airlines. Cases
12 such as this one where air carriers do something that is
13 unusual and unexpected and thereby cause a passenger's
14 death or bodily injury can be expected to remain
15 relatively few under the convention, as they are under
16 U.S. domestic law. Imposing liability, meanwhile, enables
17 passengers and their families to receive some measure of
18 compensation for their injuries and provides appropriate
19 incentives for airline supervision and -- and training of
20 their personnel.

21 For all of these reasons, we'd ask the judgment
22 of the court of appeals be affirmed.

23 QUESTION: Thank you, Ms. McDowell.

24 Mr. Harakas, you have 3 minutes remaining.

25 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF ANDREW J. HARAKAS

1 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

2 MR. HARAKAS: Mr. Chief Justice, I think when
3 you -- when you look at the arguments that were made both
4 by the respondents and the Solicitor General, it all comes
5 back to the issue of negligence, wanting to equate an
6 accident with negligence.

7 The Warsaw Convention wasn't an all-encompassing
8 treaty. There were certain holes left in the convention
9 where there wasn't going to be recovery. For example, if
10 there's no bodily injury, there's no recovery under the
11 Warsaw Convention, as set forth by the Floyd decision, no
12 matter, let's say, how egregious the air carrier's conduct
13 may have been. It set forth certain things, and the
14 convention wanted to define the liability based on the --
15 by using that term accident not making reference to
16 various common law notions.

17 I think one of the problems that we're seeing is
18 that confusing what is the accident -- and that's why I
19 always come back to the injury-producing event. In the
20 hijacking situation, for example, the accident there isn't
21 the failure of the airline to conduct proper screening and
22 allowing the hijackers to come on board the aircraft. The
23 accident is those hijackers get on the -- on the airplane
24 and they injure a passenger. And that -- the injury
25 itself is the accident. Just like in the smoke example,

1 if there was a fire someplace and the cabin filled up with
2 smoke, the smoke itself injuring the passenger is the
3 accident. Why the smoke got there is completely
4 irrelevant.

5 So when you -- when you start injecting the
6 whole concepts of negligence, I think you upset the whole
7 balance of the convention, and -- and one of the principal
8 goals of the convention was to have a uniformity and to
9 limit the liability of the carrier. In fact, the Montreal
10 Convention of 1999, which just -- which just entered into
11 force last week here in the United States, retained the
12 term accident. The issue of whether the carrier should be
13 liable for the state of the health of the passenger has
14 always been a very special and unique issue in the context
15 of the convention's history. Post-ratification conduct
16 from 1945 all the way through the -- all the way to the --
17 the Montreal Convention of 1999, the contracting states
18 were very careful and very reluctant to make the carriers
19 liable for injuries arising out of their -- out of the
20 state of health of the passenger.

21 And the -- with respect to the policy arguments
22 where they say -- where the respondents and Solicitor
23 General say that the -- there are certainly policy reasons
24 should be considered in weighing in favor of the
25 passengers in this instance, I think when you look to --

1 you have to apply the strict terms of the convention. And
2 each time this Court has been confronted with similar
3 policy arguments, they have been rejected. In Saks, the
4 -- the passenger was left without a remedy because they
5 couldn't -- because the passenger couldn't satisfy the --
6 the accident condition precedent. The same thing in
7 Floyd. There they couldn't satisfy the bodily injury
8 requirement. And in Tseng, where the -- there was no
9 remedy allowed under State law when they couldn't satisfy
10 the accident or the bodily injury conditions precedent.

11 Focusing on what the injury-producing event and
12 whether that event is unusual, unexpected, and external to
13 the passenger -- thank you, Your Honor.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: Thank you, Mr.
15 Harakas.

16 The case is submitted.

17 (Whereupon, at 12:04 p.m., the case in the
18 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25